

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Examiner Layno is thanked for his thorough examination of the subject Patent Application.

Reconsideration of the rejection of Claims 6-16 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement, is requested, based on the following.

In the specification, the paragraphs beginning on page 3; line 12 and page 8; line 7 have been removed as suggested by the Applicant . Paragraph beginning on page 8 line 11 has been amended to further clarify the point system of the word game. Paragraph beginning on page 8; line 17 has been amended to further clarify the applications of the special cards designated “Wild” and “Special Function” cards. No new matter has been added.

Claims 6, 8, 9-11 and 13-16 remain in this application. Claims 1-5, 7 and 12 have been cancelled.

Reconsideration of the rejection of Claims 6, 8, 9, and 15 under 35 U.S.C., 102(b), as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Marcle et al., is requested, in light of the following arguments.

Marcley et al, teaches a card game using two decks of cards, a first deck containing 210 cards including eight of every letter of the alphabet, the second deck displaying three words, a three letter word, a four letter word and a five letter word. Each player is dealt twelve cards from the first deck and one card from the second deck. The object of the game is for a player to draw and discard cards of the first deck to acquire letters matching the letters of the words on the card from the second deck. Marcley et al's card game is a game of chance, that is, the player who can match the letters of the three words contained on the card of the second deck firstly, wins the game. This does not require forming words by an individual's learned vocabulary, that is, words which could be esoteric in nature, only known and used by a few.

The applicant wishes to highlight that the number of cards provided in a deck is different. Each deck, of the invention, has a total of 72 cards. The number of cards covering the 26 letters of the alphabet has a letter to card ratio that is unique and challenging as described on page two of the specification.

Moreover, applicant's cards are purely educational in nature with alphabet symbols only. Marcley's card game does not involve any point system. The cards provided by the applicant's game have alphabets and merit and demerit points on each card. Each letter of the alphabet has a varied distribution depending on common usage of letters in the English language as described in paragraph 1 on page 2. The applicant became aware of the difficulty to form words on the basis of the alphabet cards, therefore, the Special function cards were added. The combination of letters to form a meaningful word is not

limited to 3, 4, of 5 letters as given in Marcley's game. The only restriction given is for each player to obtain a "passport." first. That is, the forming of a 4 letter word from the player's dealt hand for them to participate. After the "passport" word is formed, the player may use any number of letters to form words.

As for the kinds of words that are acceptable would depend on the knowledge level of the players and anything that players can create and agree on . The card game of the invention can be made as flexible as the players want. The players can decide on the theme of the play. The objective is to make the game interesting and enjoyable by all the players.

Reconsideration of the rejection of Claims 7, 12, 13, 14 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), as being unpatentable over Marcley et al., as applied to claim 6 above, and further in view of (Zeng and Scrabble) is requested, in light of the following arguments.

Marcley et al, teaches a card game using two decks of cards, a first deck containing 210 cards including eight of every letter of the alphabet, the second deck displaying three words, a three letter word, a four letter word and a five letter word. Each player is dealt twelve cards from the first deck and one card from the second deck The object of the game is for a player to draw and discard cards of the first deck to acquire letters matching the letters of the words on the card from the second deck. Marcley et al's card game is a game of chance, that is, the player who can match the letters of the three words contained on the card of the second deck firstly, wins the game. This does not require forming

words by an individual's learned vocabulary, that is, words which could be esoteric in nature, only known and used by a few.

With regard to claim 14, the applicant agrees with Examiner Layno's objections, however, wishes to highlight that the number of cards provided in a deck is different. Each deck, of the invention, has a total of 72 cards. The number of cards covering the 26 letters of the alphabet has a letter to card ratio that is unique and challenging as described on page two of the specification.

Although, Zeng and Scrabble are directed towards remotely similar applications. While playing the game of Scrabble, players are required to change their card(s). The game provided by this invention allows players to discard and to replace the discard with one from the deck. Moreover, the players are required to supply the meaning of the word formed by them. It is not a challenge from an opposing player. The criteria for awarding point value is based on a different concept from that provided in the cited art of Zeng's game. The purpose of the special function cards, of the invention, i.e., the "Wild" and "Special" cards is to make the game flexible in forming whole meaningful words and not to make plural versions of any cast words nor to challenge the opposing player as taught in Scrabble. In view of the above, the applicant respectfully states that the purpose and usages of "S" cards in the game of scrabble and the purpose of the "Wild" and "Special" cards, of this invention, is very different in concept.

The cards provided by Zeng contain poker symbols. The applicant wants to

emphasize that applicant's cards are purely educational in nature with alphabet symbols only. Marcley's card game does not involve any point system. The cards provided by the applicant's game have alphabets and merit and demerit points on each card. Each letter of the alphabet has a varied distribution depending on common usage of letters in the English language as described in paragraph 1 on page 2. The applicant became aware of the difficulty to form words on the basis of the alphabet cards, therefore, the Special function cards were added. The combination of letters to form a meaningful word is not limited to 3, 4, or 5 letters as given in Marcley's game. The only restriction given is for each player to obtain a "passport." first. That is, the forming of a 4 letter word from the player's dealt hand for them to participate. After the "passport" word is formed, the player may use any number of letters to form words.

As for the kinds of words that are acceptable would depend on the knowledge level of the players and anything that players can create and agree on. The card game of the invention can be made as flexible as the players want. The players can decide on the theme of the play. The objective is to make the game interesting and enjoyable by all the players. It is respectfully suggested that the combination of these references cannot be made without reference to Applicant's own invention. None of the references addresses the use of both a merit and demerit point system to determine a winner. Applicant teaches a card game with a predefined and agreed upon set of ground rules. The determination of a winner is through word power vocabulary and planning of how to win by carefully casting or holding cards to achieve a higher point count when the final points are calculated.

The Alphabet Challenge Card game shown in FIGs. 1 - 4 and Claims 6 - 16 are believed to be novel and patentable over these various references. It is respectfully suggested that the combination of these references cannot be made without reference to Applicant's own invention. None of the references addresses the use of both a merit and demerit point system to determine a winner. Applicant teaches a card game with a predefined and agreed upon set of ground rules. The determination of a winner is through word power vocabulary and planning of how to win by carefully casting or holding cards to achieve a higher point count when the final points are calculated. That is to say, there must be something in the prior art or line of reasoning to suggest that the combination of these remote applications is desirable or evident to a word game enthusiast. We believe that there is no such basis for the combination. We therefore request that Examiner Layno reconsider the rejection in view of these arguments and the amendments to the specification and claims.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Stephen B. Ackerman, Reg. # 37,761

Tel.: (845) 452-5863